

1 **RESHMA KAMATH**

2 700 El Camino Real, Suite 120, #1084

3 Menlo Park, California 94025, United States

4 Ph.: 650 257 0719, E.: reshmakamath2021@gmail.com

5 *IN PROPRIA PERSONA*

6  
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

8  
9 **RESHMA KAMATH,**

10 **Plaintiff,**

11 **v.**

12  
13 **SAN FRANCISCO POLICE**  
**DEPARTMENT (SFPD); UNITED**  
**STATES DEPARTMENT OF**  
**HOMELAND SECURITY; FEDERAL**  
**PROTECTIVE SERVICES; AND**  
**DOES 1-10, INCLUSIVE,**

14  
15 **Defendants.**

16  
17 **Case Number: 3:23-CV-3531-JSC**

18  
19 **OBJECTION TO THE CLERK'S**  
**MISSTATEMENT ON THE**  
**DOCKET**

20  
21 **HEARING:**

22 Date: March 14, 2024

23 Time: 10:00 a.m. Pacific Time

24 Place: Courtroom 8 - 19th Floor 450  
Golden Gate Ave. San Francisco, CA  
94102

25  
26  
27 **TO THE HONORABLE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND ATTORNEYS OF**  
RECORD, HEREIN:

1 Yet another misstatement from the Clerk of this Court on the docket. The  
2 rescheduling states motion to dismiss of **defendants City and County of San**  
3 **Francisco.** That is not only incorrect, but it is yet again the Clerk's falsification of  
4 information on the court docket. Code of Ethics for the Court Employees of  
5 California. [<https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/codethic-courtemp.pdf>].  
6

7 The correct party is **defendant San Francisco Police Department.** Even  
8 misspelling the word, San Francisco in the process. Such incompetence from  
9 judicial clerks must be addressed. Because the particular clerk may also aid in  
10 writing the ruling on defendant's motion to dismiss.  
11

12 The section on suable entities in Plaintiff's meritorious Opposition, to the  
13 motion to dismiss, correctly points out that under section 1983, the **defendant San**  
14 **Francisco Police Department** is a suable entity – whether a public  
15 agency/department or not.  
16

17 Thus, their name must be reflected on the docket – until a ruling is made as to  
18 otherwise. If the Court has already pre-determined a ruling based on preconceptions  
19 then that would be the court's failure to rule on the merits.  
20

21 **FEBRUARY 26, 2024**  
22

23 **RESHMA KAMATH**  
24

25   
26

27 Reshma Kamath,  
28 *In Propria Persona*

## **PROOF OF SERVICE**

F.R.C.P. 5 / C.C.P. § 1013(a)(3), C.C.P. § 1010.6(a)(6) / Cal. R. Ct. R. 2.260

I am employed in the County of San Mateo, California. I am over the age of 18, and not a party to this action. My mailing address is: 700 El Camino Real, Suite 120, #1084, Menlo Park, California 94025, and my e-mail address is reshmakamath2021@gmail.com for electronic-service. On February 26, 2024, I served the following document(s) on: SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST.

**OBJECTION TO THE CLERK'S MISSTATEMENT ON THE DOCKET;  
PROOF OF SERVICE**

## ELECTRONIC SERVICE

In electronically transmitting courtesy copies of the document(s) listed above to the email-address(es) of the person(s) set forth on the attached service list. To my knowledge, the transmission was reported as complete and without error, as per the electronic service agreement between all parties and their attorneys of record, herein.

[NOTICE OF C.C.P. SECTION 1010.6.]

## SERVICE LIST

Wald, Abigail Abigail.Wald@sfcityatty.org

David Chiu David.chiu@sfcityatty.org

James Hanwalt James.hanwalt@sfcityatty.org,

Ray Feliciano ray.feliciano@sfcityatty.org,

Anita Murdock anita.murdock@sfcityatty.org,

Monica Trejo monica.trejo@sfcityatty.org

Attorneys for Defendant San Francisco Police Department

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on **FEBRUARY 26, 2024.**

RESHMA KAMATH

*✓ Reshma Kamath*